



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,528	03/11/2005	Toshiyuki Tsubouchi	267014US0PCT	7444
22850 7590 09/11/2008 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER MCAVOY, ELLEN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/527,528	TSUBOUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ellen M. McAvoy	1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04 April 2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1797

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submissions, amendments to the claims and remarks, filed on 02 July 2008, have been entered.

Claim Objections

Claims 16-18 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. These dependent claims set forth as component (B) hydrogenated polyisobutylene which is outside the scope of polymer component (B) in independent claim 1 which contains at least 10 mole % of a monomer bearing a cyclic structure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1797

Claims 1-10 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al (6,319,879) in combination with Bartley et al (7,045,488) and Wedlock et al (6,303,550).

Applicants' arguments filed 02 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As previously set forth, Yoshida et al ["Yoshida"] disclose derivatives of bicyclo[2.2.1]heptane useful as traction drive fluids, represented by formula (VII) in column 2, which have a high traction coefficient under high temperatures and an excellent viscosity characteristic under low temperatures. Yoshida teaches that the traction drive fluids have the following properties: (a) molecular weight of 210 or larger, (b) kinematic viscosity at 40°C of 10-25 mm²/s, (c) viscosity index of 60 or higher, (d) pour point of -40°C or lower, (e) density at 20°C of 0.93 g/cm³ or higher, and (f) traction coefficient at 140°C of 90% or higher of the coefficient of 2,4-dicyclohexyl-2-methylpentane. See column 3, lines 1-21. Yoshida also teaches that the traction drive fluids include the hydrogenated dimers of bicyclo [3,2,1] octane ring compounds, bicyclo [3,3,0] octane ring compounds and bicyclo[2,2,2] octane ring compounds. See column 8, lines 58-64 and column 10, lines 17-58. The examiner maintains the position that the traction drive fluids of Yoshida meet the limitations of base oil component (A) of the claims which has been amended to specific base oils for traction drives including the above recited base oils. Applicants' invention differs from Yoshida by adding component (B), a hydrocarbon polymer having a weight average molecular weight in the range of 8,000 to 40,000 which comprises as a constituent at least 10 mole % of a monomer bearing a cyclic structure and hydrogenated products thereof, which acts as a viscosity index improver to the traction drive fluid. However, Yoshida allows for the addition of conventional additives to the traction drive

Art Unit: 1797

fluid including viscosity index improvers. See column 11, lines 45-50. Bartley is added to teach that traction fluids may additionally contain polymeric viscosity index modifiers including hydrogenated polymers of styrene with butadiene or isoprene. See column 8, lines 1-23.

Wedlock discloses lubricating oil compositions containing diblock copolymers of styrene and a conjugated diene such as butadiene and isoprene which have a molecular weight in the range of 8,000 to 30,000. The examiner is of the position that Bartley and Wedlock meet the limitation of component (B) which has a molecular weight overlapping this range. Having the prior art references before the inventors at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to have added an additional polymeric viscosity modifier such as the styrene/butadiene or styrene/isoprene polymer component disclosed in Bartley and Wedlock to the traction drive fluid of Yoshida. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation relied on by the examiner is the disclosure in Yoshida allowing for the addition of other additives to the traction drive fluid including viscosity index improvers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-10 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe et al (5,283,384) in combination with Bartley et al (7,045,488) and Wedlock et al (6,303,550).

Applicants' arguments filed 02 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As previously set forth, Abe et al ["Abe"] disclose a traction drive fluid composition comprising a hydrocarbon having a bicyclo octane skeleton such as bicyclo[3,2,1] octane, bicyclo [2,2,2] octane and bicyclo[3,3,0] octane. Abe teaches that the traction drive fluids may contain a hydrogenated dimer or co-dimer of the bicyclo octanes. See column 5, lines 52-59. The examiner maintains the position that the traction drive fluids of Abe meet the limitations of base oil component (A) of the claims which has been amended to specific base oils for traction drives including the above recited base oils. Applicants' invention differs from Abe by adding component (B), a hydrocarbon polymer having a weight average molecular weight in the range of 8,000 to 40,000 which comprises as a constituent at least 10 mole % of a monomer bearing a cyclic structure and hydrogenated products thereof, which acts as a viscosity index improver to the traction drive fluid. However, Abe allows for the addition of conventional additives to the traction drive fluid including viscosity index improvers. See column 11, lines 22-58. Bartley is added to teach that traction fluids may additionally contain polymeric viscosity index modifiers including hydrogenated polymers of styrene with butadiene or isoprene. See column 8, lines 1-23. Wedlock discloses lubricating oil compositions containing diblock copolymers of styrene and a conjugated diene such as butadiene and isoprene which have a molecular weight in the range of 8,000 to 30,000. The examiner is of the position that Bartley and Wedlock meet the

Art Unit: 1797

limitation of component (B) which has a molecular weight overlapping this range. Having the prior art references before the inventors at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to have added an additional polymeric viscosity modifier such as the styrene/butadiene or styrene/isoprene polymer component disclosed in Bartley and Wedlock to the traction drive fluid of Abe. As set forth above, the motivation to make the combination relied on by the examiner is the disclosure in Abe allowing for the addition of other additives to the traction drive fluid including hydrocarbon oils and viscosity index improvers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-6 and 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murai et al (4,889,649) in combination with Bartley et al (7,045,488) and Wedlock et al (6,303,550).

Applicants' arguments filed 02 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As previously set forth, Murai et al ["Murai"] disclose a traction drive fluid containing, as a base stock, a composition composed of 40 to 80 weight % of a 2,4-dicyclohexyl-2-methylpentane and 20 to 60 weight % of a mixture of polycyclohexylalkane and a perhydroindane derivative. The examiner maintains the position that the traction drive fluids of Murai meet the limitations of base oil component (A) of the claims which has been amended to specific base oils for traction drives including the above recited base oils. Applicants' open-ended claim language "comprising" allows for the addition of other additives to the composition including the mixture of polycyclohexylalkane and a perhydroindane derivative disclosed in Murai. Applicants' invention differs from Murai by adding component (B), a hydrocarbon

Art Unit: 1797

polymer having a weight average molecular weight in the range of 8,000 to 40,000 which comprises as a constituent at least 10 mole % of a monomer bearing a cyclic structure and hydrogenated products thereof, which acts as a viscosity index improver to the traction drive fluid. However, Murai allows for the addition of conventional additives to the traction drive fluid including polyisobutylene and its hydrogenated product as viscosity index improvers. See column 5, lines 18-35. Bartley is added to teach that traction fluids may additionally contain polymeric viscosity index modifiers including hydrogenated polymers of styrene with butadiene or isoprene. See column 8, lines 1-23. Wedlock discloses lubricating oil compositions containing diblock copolymers of styrene and a conjugated diene such as butadiene and isoprene which have a molecular weight in the range of 8,000 to 30,000. The examiner is of the position that Bartley and Wedlock meet the limitation of component (B) which has a molecular weight overlapping this range. Having the prior art references before the inventors at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to have added an additional polymeric viscosity modifier such as the styrene/butadiene or styrene/isoprene polymer component disclosed in Bartley and Wedlock to the traction drive fluid of Murai. As set forth above, the motivation to make the combination relied on by the examiner is the disclosure in Murai allowing for the addition of other additives to the traction drive fluid including viscosity index improvers.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ellen M. McAvoy whose telephone number is (571) 272-1451. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-5:00) with alt. Fridays off.

Art Unit: 1797

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ellen M McAvoy/

Ellen M McAvoy
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1797

EMcAvoy
September 5, 2008